



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/376,017	08/19/1999	STANLEY YAMANE	ATV-005	5919

21323 7590 04/09/2002

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELM I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PA

TS

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/376,017	Applicant(s) YAMANE ET AL.	
	Examiner Salad E Abdullahi	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2153

Response to Amendment

1. The Amendment filed on 01/22/2002 has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's arguments filled on 01/22/2002 with regard to claims 1-10, 12-18 and 20 have been fully considered but they are moot in view new ground of rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christie et al U.S. Patent No. 6,182,117.

As per claims 1, 12 and 15, Christie et al discloses a system for notifying a computer of changes to a master source file (replicating changes in a master source file set i.e the local site A database on a destination file system), comprising the steps of:

- identifying changes in the master source file set (identifying changes made to objects in local site's database (see col. 3, lines 9-65 and col. 5, lines 13-20);
- storing the identified changes in a modification list (storing updates in an event table), (see col. 5, lines 13-37), comprising unique identifiers (UID) (see col. 3, lines 47-65);

Art Unit: 2153

- transmitting the modification list to an agent having access to a destination file stem (see col. 5, lines 13-37); and
- receiving a response from the computer indicating that the identified changes are installed (col. 6, lines 24-30 and col. 19, lines 21-27).

In considering claims 3-7, Christie et al discloses a system, wherein the identifying step comprises the steps of:

inspecting a set of files, comparing the set of files to an earlier-recorded set (see col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 10, and col. 5, lines 13-37);

installing a device driver to perform file operations and recording, by the device driver, changes to the source file set (see col. 10, lines 16-20); and

receiving a manifest (table) describing changes to the source file set (see col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 10, and col. 5, lines 13-37).

In considering claims 8-10, Christie et al discloses s system further comprising the step of calling a script of user configurable instruction (see col. 3, lines 13-24 and col. 9, lines 44-53).

As per claim 14, step of converting the first list to a second list is inherently discloses by Christie's system (see col. 5, lines 13-37 and col. 11, lines 20-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2153

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 13, 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie et al U.S. Paten No. 6,182,117 as applied to claim 1 above.

In considering claims 2 and 13, Christie et al discloses a system for replicating changes in one system's database, i.e., site A to another system, i.e., site B, including:

- identifying changes in the master source file set (identifying changes made to objects in local site's database (see col. 3, lines 9-65 and col. 5, lines 13-20);
- storing the identified changes in a modification list (storing updates in an event table), (see col. 5, lines 13-37), comprising unique identifiers (UID) (see col. 3, lines 47-65);
- transmitting the modification list to an agent having access to a destination file stem (see col. 5, lines 13-37); and
- receiving a response from the computer indicating that the identified changes are installed (col. 6, lines 24-30 and col. 19, lines 21-27).

Although the system disclosed by Christie shows substantial features of the claimed invention, as discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Christie et al, is silent the computer is a web cache server.

Nonetheless, a web cache server is well known system, part of web service system. Furthermore, Christie et al discloses replicating data between computer sites which are located remotely from each other indicating this replication process can obviously be utilized in web cache server

Art Unit: 2153

system in order to replicate data from a particular web site to a web caching servers closer to the client computers. Although, Christie does not call the computer a web cache server it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to utilize the replicating process taught by Christie's system in a web cache servers, because it is a design choice.

In considering claims 16-18 and 20, Christie et al discloses a system for replicating changes in one system's database, i.e., site A to another system, i.e., site B, including:

- identifying changes in the master source file set (identifying changes made to objects in local site's database (see col. 3, lines 9-65 and col. 5, lines 13-20);
- storing the identified changes in a modification list (storing updates in an event table), (see col. 5, lines 13-37), comprising unique identifiers (UID) (see col. 3, lines 47-65);
- transmitting the modification list to an agent having access to a destination file stem (see col. 5, lines 13-37); and
- receiving a response from the computer indicating that the identified changes are installed (col. 6, lines 24-30 and col. 19, lines 21-27).

Christie et al, is silent the computer system includes a web cache system.

Nonetheless, a web cache system is well known system, part of web service system. Furthermore, Christie et al discloses replicating data between computer sites which are located remotely from each other indicating this replication process can obviously be utilized in web cache system in order to replicate data from a particular web site to a web caching servers closer to the client

Art Unit: 2153

computers. Although, Christie does not call the computer system as web cache server system it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to utilize the replicating process taught by Christie's system in a web cache server system, because it is a design choice.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

CONCLUSION

8. The prior art made of record and relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicants disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Abdullahi E. Salad** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8441**. The

Art Unit: 2153

examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from **8:30AM to 5:00PM**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervise, **Glen Burgess**, can be reached at **(703)305-4792**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is **(703)305-3900**.

Any response to this action should mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238, (after final communications)

(703) 746-7239, (Official communications)

(703) 746-7240, (Non-Official/Draft).

AS

4/1/2002



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner